App F. IX-4

1928 5-26

File No. 325-25

Previous References
9.wz 92-27 Sec 1-5 250-19 Sec 1-4 wz)
122-04 Sec 1-19 658-19
187-1, Sec 1-2 781-18
256-11 Sec 1-2 592-20
271-09 Sec 1-16 92-21
Later References 348-21.

Serial Nos.

(6)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos.

Part B for wz 27

SUBJECT

Interpellations to be answered at the Legislative Council in June 1926.

To
The wz Govt
1597-602 Sec 9 6-26
Calls for replies re Resolt
the Sri Rangam Headmany
at Srirangapatnam

JM

1925

Inezrai

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

NOTES.

File No. 325-1925

FILE HEADING.

Interpellation to be answered in the Legislative Council of June 1926

From

Mr. B. L. Bayanna.

No. 491 ~~Dated~~ ~~Received~~

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Interpellation re the power of the Amildar, Srirangapatam Taluk, over the Peshkar of Sri Ranganatha Swamy ~~temple at Srirangapatam~~

NOTES AND ORDERS.

By the Inezrai Comr.

No. 1597-602 Dy 9.6.26

Calls for replies on above Interpellation

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 1881—GPB—30,000—JE-3-21

ue

nt. Muz. File No. of 19

Serial No

Postcard with M.C. Enclosed Letter (Urdu) (X)

The Statement of replies received from the Muz. Com. is submitted.

A Supt. Statement containing the interpellations, and the replies in juxta-position, is submitted as indicated

19.6.26. The replies furnished by the M.C. (J.C.) are accepted in the typed Statement of questions & answers, (J.C.S.), except for question (d), for which a direct answer "No" is proposed

The replies in J.C.S. may be approved.

Rev. Sec'y 19/6

20.6.26

867/20.6

2nd member) Approved. The replies not to give a direct reply to (i)

Muz. 20/6/26

The matter now under correspondence with Muz. File 322-25

21/7/26

File No. of 19 .

General Secret

Serial No.

H/1

THE MYSORE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

(June 1926)

Mr. B. L. Byanna.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
8-JUN1926
MUZRAI
D 1471
Muz 325-26-6

40 ~~IV.~~ Will the Government be pleased to state that with reference to answers given by the Government to question No.13 of the 1926 -- February Session of this Council:- (a),

(a) Whether the Amildar had any power to relieve on his own - authority the Peishkar of his duties prescribed by the Order of --- Government ?

(b) Did the Amildar consult the Dharmadarsies before acting in the matter ?

(c) Did not the Dharmadarsies point out at the very first meeting after the orders of the Amildar, the irregularity thereof.

(d) Is it a fact that the Amildar trifled with the views of the Dharmadarsies by observing that the expression of such views was beyond their powers ?

(e) were not the copies of proceedings of the Dharmadarsies sent to the Deputy Commissioner and the Muzrai Commissioner ?

(f) What action has been taken regarding the conduct of the -- Amildar for the disobedience shown by him to the orders of the Government defining the duties of the Peishkar ?

(g) Was not the representation referred to in answer (e) made by the citizens of Seringapatam consisting of advocates, pleaders, landholders and merchants ?

(h) Are the Government justified in saying that those persons belong to the faction of the Peishkar ?

(i) Will not such remarks on the part of the Government deter - respectable persons to go to the head of a District to ventilate -- their grievances against high-handed actions of local officers ?

No. 1597--1602/Muz.525-28-7.

To

The Mysore Commissioner.

Dear Sir,

I am desired to forward herewith copy of Interpellation No. to be answered at the ensuing Legislative - - Council at Mysore and to request you to send up suitable draft replies thereto so as to reach this office on the 12th inst. the latest.

Yours sincerely,

Interpellation by Mr. B.L. Byanna.

Interpellation	Reply
Will the Govt. be pleased to state that with reference to answers given by the Govt. to question No. 13 of the 1926 - February Session of this Council:	
(a) Whether the Amildar had any power to to relieve on his own authority the Peshkar, of his duties prescribed by the Order of Government?	No. The Amildar relieved the Peshkar of a part of his ~~dmkx~~ duties, pending orders of the Sub-Division Officer to whom he reported the matter. The Sub.Divn. Officer acquiesced in it.
(b) Did the Amildar consult the Dharmadarsis before acting in the matter?	No, since it was not necessary under the rules.
(c) Did not the Dharmadarsis point out at the very first meeting after the orders of the Amildar, the irregularity thereon?	Yes, by adopting a resolution.
(d) Is it a fact that the Amildar trifled with the views of the Dharmadarsis by observing that the expression of such views was beyond their powers.	No. He sent up the resolution to the SDO with his report on the matter
(e) Were not the copies of proceedings of the Dharmadarsis sent to the Deputy Commr. and the Muz. Commr.	Yes.
(f) What action has been taken regarding the conduct of the Amildar for the disobedience shown by him to the orders of the Govt. defining the duties of the Peshkar?	The irregularity was pointed out, ~~for future guidance.~~
(g) Was not the representation referred to in answer (e) made by the citizens of Seringapatam consisting of Advocates, Pleaders, Landholders and merchants.	Yes, by some landholders and merchants. Some Advocates and Pleaders also are stated to have approached the Deputy Commr. in this connection as private citizens on different occasions.
(h) Are the Govt. justified in saying that those persons belong to the faction of the Peshkar?	Govt. have reason to believe that there are two ~~sets of people~~ parties, one in favour of the Peshkar and one against him.
(i) Will not such remarks on the part of the Govt. deter respectable persons to go to the head of a District to ventilate their grievances against high-handed actions of local Officers?	A ~~free and sympathetic hearing~~ to all aggrieved parties either in person or through council is being given by the Dy. Commr. The petition containing the representation is stated to have been ~~accepted and enquired into.~~ Vide answer to (h)

AW 19/6

19/6

Mun 20/6/26

Interpellation No. 40, by Mr. B.L. Byanna, Member, Legislative Council.

Answers.-

Question.

(a) No. The Amildar relieved the Peshkar of a part of his duties pending orders of the Sub Division Officer to whom he reported the matter. The Sub Division Officer acquiesced in it.

(b) No, since it was not necessary under the rules.

(c) Yes, by adopting a resolution.

(d) The Amildar did not agree with the views of the dharmadarsis. He did not trifle with their views as alleged, but sent up their resolution to the Sub Division Officer with his own report in the matter.

(e) Yes.

(f) The irregularity was pointed out for future guidance.

(g) Yes, by some landholders and merchants. Some Advocates and Pleaders also are stated to have approached the Deputy Commissioner in this connection as private citizens on different occasions.

(h) ~~In this case~~ Government have reason to believe that there are two sets of people, one in favour of the Peshkar and one against him.

(i) A free and sympathetic hearing to all aggrieved parties either in person or through Counsel is being given by the Deputy Commissioner. The petition containing the representation is stated to have been accepted and enquired into

C.R. Balasundaram Ayya
Muzrai Commissioner
19/6.

* In this matter, Mr. K.R. Srinigasa Iyengar, late First Member of Council, has also made an enquiry. (Vide his Tour Notes for March 1926).